

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are presently pending, and claims 21- 25 are new.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11 and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,322,655 to Casagrande.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 6, 15 and 16, as originally recited, are not anticipated by Casagrande. Original claims 2, 3, 6, 15 and 16 have been rewritten as new independent claims 21-25.

Original claim 2 has been rewritten as new independent claim 21, and recites that the first side of the backing layer has a lesser affinity for retaining adhesive than the second side of the liner layer such that the integrated removable portion comprises a label. Original claim 16 has been rewritten as new claim 25, and recites that the first side of the backing layer has a lesser affinity for retaining adhesive than the second side of the liner layer. The Office action asserts that in Casagrande layer 43 is a backing layer, and component 41 is an adhesive layer. However, when the multiply unit 55 is removed, it is not a label. The layer 39 of the multiply unit 55 adjacent to the adhesive layer 41 is described in Casagrande as a release layer. Moreover, the Figures do not illustrate any portion of the adhesive layer 41 transferring to the release layer 39.

Original claim 3 has been rewritten as new independent claim 22, and recites that at least a portion of the second side of the base layer coextensive with the integrated tab has a greater affinity for retaining adhesive than the first side of the liner layer. Original claim 15 has been rewritten as new claim 23, and recites that at least a portion of the second side of the base layer coextensive with the integrated tab has a greater affinity for retaining adhesive than the first side of the liner layer. The Office action asserts that in Casagrande layer 35 is an adhesive layer, layer 37 is a liner layer and layer 133 is a base layer. However, when the perimeter portions 150 are removed, it does not have any adhesive thereon. Layer 134, which is adjacent to the first adhesive layer 35, is described in Casagrande as a release sublayer. Moreover, the Figures do not illustrate any portion of the first adhesive layer 35 transferring to the release sublayer 134.

Original claim 6 has been rewritten as new claim 23, and recites that the second die cut does not extend completely along the periphery edge of the tab such that the tab is partially connected to the portion. The Office action asserts that perimeter portions 150 of Casagrande comprise integrated tabs. However, there is no disclosure in Casagrande that the cuts 146 which separate the perimeter portions 150 from the multiply unit 155 are arranged to leave the perimeter portions 150 partially connected to the unit 155. Just the opposite, Casagrande discloses that the cut 146 “extends either in a closed circuit or between opposite sides of the enclosed shape” (col. 12, ll. 36-39), and are removed and discarded (col. 13, ll. 4-8).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11 and 13-16, as presently recited, are not anticipated by Casagrande.

Casagrande does not disclose an integrated tab comprising a portion of the base layer and being surrounded by the integrated removable portion, as presently recited in claim 1 and by dependency in claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 11 and 13. Casagrande also does not disclose making a second die cut extending substantially through a base layer and coextensive with the integral removable portion to substantially define a periphery edge of an integrated tab surrounded by the integral removable portion, as presently recited in claim 14 and by dependency in claims 15 and 16.

Instead, Casagrande discloses a structure having a removable multiply unit 155 with two pieces, a carrier subunit 138 of layers 133, 130, 132 and 134 and a combined unit of layers 35, 37 and 39, as illustrated in Figs. 8 and 9. The removable multiply unit 155 is defined in part by cuts 46. Perimeter portions 150 are removable from the carrier subunit 138 along cuts 146, as illustrated in Fig. 9. The perimeter portions 150 are on the perimeter of the carrier subunit, and thus are not surrounded by the carrier subunit.

Claims 4, 7-10 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casagrande in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,736,212 to Fischer. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casagrande. Given the above discussion of Casagrande with respect to claims 1 and 14, from which claims 4 and 7-10 and 17-20 depend, respectively, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4 and 7-10 and 17-20 are not unpatentable over the cited references.

Appl. No. 10/817,543
Amdt. Dated May 19, 2006
Reply to Office action dated February 21, 2006

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-25 are allowable, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-25 are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required in this application to Deposit Account No. 06-135.

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

Dated: May 19, 2006

By: s/Jon A. Birmingham/
Jon A. Birmingham
Registration No. 51,222

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
120 S. LaSalle Street, Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406
Telephone: 312-577-7000
Facsimile: 312-577-7007

449826